



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,107	06/14/2001	Darci T. Home	044921-5028	4972

9629 7590 06/20/2002

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

CHAKRABARTI, ARUN K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/880,107

Applicant(s)

HORNE ET AL.

Examiner

Arun Chakrabarti

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*.

Art Unit: 1634

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13, drawn to method of diagnosis of a disease, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - II. Claims 4, 8, and 12, drawn to method of treating a disease, classified in class 435, subclass 94.
 - III. Claims 14-16, drawn to screening a drug, classified in class 436, subclass 501.
 - IV. Claims 17-23, drawn to oligonucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 22.1.
 - V. Claims 24-30, and 44-46, drawn to solid support, classified in class 422, subclass 68.1.
 - VI. Claims 31-38, drawn to computer, classified in class 700, subclass 90.
 - VII. Claims 39-43, drawn to method of using a computer, classified in class 360, subclass 39.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Groups I and (II-III and V-VIII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of method of diagnosis of a disease of Group I is not

Art Unit: 1634

disclosed as capable of use together with method of treating a disease of Group II, screening a drug of Group III, solid support of Group V, computer of Group VI, and method of using a computer of Group VII and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects.

3. Inventions of Groups I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the oligonucleotides of Group IV can be used in the diagnosis of a disease of Group I or can be used to make RNA and protein or can be used to make antisense nucleic acid for gene therapy.

4. Inventions of Groups II and (III and V-VII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of method of treating a disease of Group II, is not disclosed as capable of use together with screening a drug of Group III, solid support of Group V, computer of Group VI, and method of using a computer of Group VII and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects.

5. Inventions of Groups II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for

Art Unit: 1634

using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the oligonucleotides of Group IV can be used in method of treating a disease of Group II or can be used to make RNA and protein or can be used to detect a disease by nucleic acid hybridization.

6. Inventions of Groups III and (V-VII) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of screening a drug of Group III, is not disclosed as capable of use together with solid support of Group V, computer of Group VI, and method of using a computer of Group VII and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects.

7. Inventions of Groups III and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the oligonucleotides of Group IV can be used in method of screening a drug of Group III, or can be used to make RNA and protein or can be used to detect a disease by nucleic acid hybridization or can be used to make antisense nucleic acid for gene therapy.

Art Unit: 1634

8. Inventions of Groups IV and V-VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions the different inventions of oligonucleotides of Group IV, is not disclosed as capable of use together with solid support of Group V, computer of Group VI, and method of using a computer of Group VII and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects.

9. Inventions of Groups V and VI-VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of solid support of Group V, is not disclosed as capable of use together with, computer of Group VI, and method of using a computer of Group VII and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects.

10. Inventions of Groups VI and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the method of using the computer of Group VII as claimed to identify the expression level of a gene can be practiced by the computer of Group VI or by northern blot.

Art Unit: 1634

11. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

12. All claims are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising thousands of nucleotides sequences in Tables 3-9. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect any two disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

13. A telephone call was made to F. Pierre Vander-Vegt on May 7, 2002 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CAR 1.143).

14. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CAR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CAR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CAR 1.17(I).

Art Unit: 1634

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group analyst Chantae Dessau whose telephone number is (703) 605-1237. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission via the P.T.O. Fax Center located In Crystal Mall 1. The CM1 Fax Center numbers for Technology Center 1600 are either (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242. Please note that the faxing of such papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published In the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

Arun Chakrabarti

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1634

June 6, 2002


W. Gary Jones
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600